

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

**John H. Boner Community Center**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	<b>Approaching Standard (2)</b>	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>		<b>Instruction is clear</b>	<b>Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)</b>	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	
<b>Academic Program</b>		<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	<b>Meeting Standard (3)</b>	<b>Financial viability</b>	
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	<b>Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)</b>		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<b>Satisfactory*</b>	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 3:1, 5:1</b>	<b>Meeting Standard (3)</b>		

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since John H. Boner Community Center's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).*

### ACTION NEEDED:

\*Corrective action plans were submitted to ensure tutoring begins and ends on time and to ensure that tutoring is individualized in group settings to the extent possible. Additionally, if John H. Boner Community Center elects to use the Odyssey program in 2008-2009, it will submit an amendment to the IDOE.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** John H. Boner Community Center  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 4/23/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional development agendas</li> <li>Tutor sign-in sheet for both trainings</li> <li>Tutor certificates for both trainings</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tutors participate in two "What Works" trainings. One training covered techniques that benefit youth, and the other training covered creating an effective learning environment. Training also covered the assessment, behavior management, student safety, youth development, and curriculum.</li> <li>Professional development (What Works) matches professional development description in originally approved application.</li> <li>Tutor certificates and sign-in sheets for the two trainings were provided. All tutors attended both trainings.</li> </ul>
Progress Reporting	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports for 6 students</li> <li>Documentation of progress reports sent</li> <li>Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>SES contract for IPS</li> <li>SES agreements for 6 students</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports include all information required on the IDOE progress reporting checklist.</li> <li>Progress reports are parent-friendly and include information about student progress in completing daily assignments and work, student attendance, and student progress on re-tests in both Reading and Math.</li> <li>Progress reports should also include student pre-test scores and, as applicable, student scores on re-tests (revised progress report was submitted).</li> <li>Progress reports include student goals</li> </ul>

					<p>from the SES agreement and progress made toward the goals in parent-friendly language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reporting logs indicate that progress reports are sent to parents every three weeks and are for a particular reporting period during those weeks.</li> <li>• Goals on SES agreements match goals on progress reports.</li> <li>• Per the school district, progress reports have been sent in an appropriate and timely manner.</li> </ul>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of process for developing plans</li> <li>• Goal attainment plans for 6 students</li> <li>• Correlation of assessment to Indiana standards</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal Attainment Plans are used as individual learning plans. Plans are developed collaboratively with parents, teachers, and the education specialist.</li> <li>• Goal Attainment Plans include teacher's concerns, parent's concerns, and education specialist's concerns. Attainment Plans also include student strengths.</li> <li>• Student goals are listed on Goal Attainment Plans. All student goals are the same (gain the equivalency of one chronological year as measured by the Evaluation of Basic Skills test).</li> <li>• Goal attainment plans include pre-test scores from the Evaluation of Basic Skills.</li> <li>• Assessment reveals areas of weakness and determines a student's level of basic concept understanding in math, reading, and spelling. Raw test score is converted into chronological age.</li> <li>• Examples of specific standards covered by the assessment were provided.</li> <li>• Goal Attainment Plans include strategies and interventions to meet goals. A plan was submitted to describe how tutoring will be individualized in group settings.</li> </ul>

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** John H. Boner Community Center

**SITE:** East 10<sup>th</sup> Street United Methodist Church

2327 E. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Indianapolis, IN 46201

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** J.H., J.C.-H.

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 2

**DATE:** 4/10/08

**REVIEWERS:** MC, CE

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:30PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>Students were split into two groups. One group was working on computers, while another group was working with a tutor on a math lesson. In the group working with the tutor, they were working on a math lesson using Indiana academic standards resources and focusing on “how many are left.” The tutor gave the students number stories, and students had to illustrate the number story using beans. After students had practiced the bean counting one or two times, they were instructed to work on the “how many are left” worksheet.</p> <p>Students working on the computer were using the Time for Learning computer program (Odyssey). Students had to complete 80% mastery on computer lessons. Students were mostly working on math and money problems—adding double columns with multiple choice questions. Students also had math sentences and money counting to do. On the math sentences, students had to pick a number from a multiple choice list. A tutor stood by them and gave them directions when they had questions about how to use the computers. However, the tutor did not provide much facilitation with the actual lessons. Although one tutor did ask students how they were doing on various lessons, if students said they had not passed with 80% mastery, the tutor didn’t ask them where they were struggling or help them with these sections; instead, the tutor just indicated that they would have to do it again.</p> <p>Tutoring session description in the original application indicates that students will participate in lessons that have a multi-sensory approach that connects new concepts to prior concepts and include group practice and independent practice activities. While the lesson observed with the tutor (the math lesson) did include modeling and one group practice activity (the bean counting), it was very brief (5-10 minutes). Students did the</p>

				<p>independent practice for about 10 minutes and then were told that it was time to get ready to work on homework. It is unclear why the lesson itself was so brief.</p> <p>Additionally, the approved application states that the Lexia SOS Computer Reading program will be used. However, in the observed session, students were working on the Odyssey Time for Learning computer program and only working on Math. John H. Boner has not submitted an amendment to receive approval for utilizing this computer program.</p> <p>While the math lesson appeared to reflect components of the provider's approved program, it is unclear why the lesson was so brief. Additionally, the Odyssey computer program has not been approved for use by John H. Boner Community Center.</p>
Instruction is clear		X		<p>Students who were working on lessons with the tutor appeared to understand what they were supposed to be working on and seemed to enjoy the short bean counting activity. In the brief time that instruction was observed, it seemed clear to students what the concept (how many are left) was. The tutor seemed familiar with the process to use to follow the lesson plan described in the approved application. Students working on the computer appeared to understand the lessons and how to use the computers. Instruction provided by the computer program was clear. If students had questions about how to do the lesson, tutors provided assistance with instructions.</p> <p>Tutors were very clear on providing directions to students. However, actual instruction during math lesson with the tutor was very brief due to the length of the session. The tutor working with students on the computer really only answered questions about how to use the computer and gave encouragement to students, as opposed to helping them connect concepts or build on prior knowledge. The tutor working with the small group on Math did provide instruction and followed the approved lesson plan, but as noted above, the lesson was very brief (about 20 minutes) and activities seemed a little rushed (the concept was modeled once and then students only used the beans to practice a couple of problems and then spent about 10 minutes on the independent practice section of the lesson).</p>
Time on task is appropriate			X	<p>Students working on the computer were generally on task, especially when the tutor was with them. The tutor working with the small group of students worked very hard to keep them on task and focused on the math lesson. When students got off task, the tutor redirected them and ensured that they began working again. Any time a student got up from the computers, the tutor working with the small group made sure that they were only up for a short time and then began working again.</p> <p>Although students were generally on task, parents began arriving to pick up students very early, which sometimes distracted students. Additionally, when parents arrived, one tutor often began speaking with them, which sometimes distracted other students working near the two having a conversation.</p>
		X		<p>The instructor working with the small group of students on math seemed knowledgeable of math standards and seemed knowledgeable of the levels and interests of the students that the tutor was working with. The tutor also appeared to have strong skills in behavior management and was often able to redirect students who got off task. The tutor was familiar with the lesson plan and components approved in the original application and attempted to model the concept, do a group activity, and have students to independent</p>

Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable					work. However, the amount of time that the tutor had was brief. The other tutor working with the students on the computer didn't give much instruction to them; instead, it was primarily giving them instructions on how to use the computer. When students struggled with a lesson on the computer, instructional techniques to help them with the concept or to help them connect concepts that they were struggling with to concepts they knew were not observed., although the tutor did give encouragement to students as they worked. The tutor did seem familiar with the computer program.
Student/instructor ratio: 3:1, 5:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Ratio matches description in amended application.